

ORIGINAL

In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas
Dallas Division

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

FILED

MAR 27 2003

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

By

Deputy

3:01-CV-01301-L

(USA and)

Jamal Elhaj-Chehade

Co- plaintiff

Vs.

Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates

Et al entities and individuals) Defendants

Plaintiff's response to the court latest order dated March 19, 2003

\ **March 25, 2003**

Comes now on this date, the plaintiff is filing his preliminary response to judge Lindsay latest order as follow:

this order and all the previous orders in which the plaintiff was a party against UTSW or the ECFMG Are **VOID and NULL** *ab Initio* pursuant to many rules including but not limited to FRCP rule 12 and FRCP rule 12-e in addition this order was done by a judge that the plaintiff requested his removal

the plaintiff asserts that EXPARTE Communication exists between the court and the defendants by the fact of the charade and fabricated proceedings that existed all along from the proceeding against utsw under 8 USC 1324-b (see the plaintiff vs UTSW in 3:98-cv-1622-P and related OCAHO) that the plaintiff never requested it as but rather under the compact treaty clause...such to the refusal to consolidate the previous proceedings against all parties

the plaintiff asserts that he did not fail in any proceedings that t he evidence are clear and evident against the defendants from channeling funds by the defendants to run their underground illegal operation and all are whitin the statute of limitation (see defendants incomes tax filings for the years 1997-1999; the defendant ECFMG directory / booklet 1997 pages 2 and 17, and the defendant(Dennis Donohue and other statement and their yearly salaries; to the USDC court case number in which the ECFMG was a aperty against Teknology lane and Dr Badralsadat Madani in Greenville South Carolina USDC case # 6-99-1676-24 initial complaint).

The plaintiff asserts that the court orders in favor of the defendants despite all the evidence against them are **DELIBERATELY** done and/or under the influence just to increase the **INCREASE** the cost of litigation by Unnecessary Appeals and to Dilute the plaintiff claims' on Appeals, despite the fact that all evidence are self explanantory and the plaintiff will release all the matter to the media and let the public be the judge.

the plaintiff asserts that the latest order is also null and void partly because it is an order done by a judge whose conduct is in question and who is refusing

to recluse himself from the case.

The plaintiff asserts that he reserves himself the right to divulge all the HOAX through his experience with the justice system in the US.

The plaintiff asserts that the charade justice system he encountered in the USA will not deter him from his constant search to find freedom, Liberty and happiness

The plaintiff rejects the court claim and he sees that an appeal is unnecessary because the judges and their allies want to dilute the plaintiff cause on appeals and allow room for other judges to have a bite of the spoil and to deliberately impose unnecessary burden upon the plaintiff by deliberately increasing the cost of litigation(violations of FRCP rules of reducing costs of litigations and enhancing efficiencies.

therefore, the plaintiff remains to his request to remove the judges and to conduct hearing before rendering any order --- the plaintiff challenges the judges claims that they render judgement based upon of what is in front of them by allowing hearing in the court room in which all ~~aprties~~ are present ^{→ parties} and to discuss and argue any question that the judges may have the plaintiff asserts that the judges orders are based on blindness- as judges decide what is visible and what is invisible in front of them.

the plaintiff asserts that the defendant attorney admitted on April 11, 2002 at 1:03 PM that all court orders are prearranged between the defendants(and their rep) and the court and the matter is self explanatory.

the plaintiff asserts that hearing in the court room in which all parties are present will reduce the costs of litigations and enhance the efficiencies of court and fully expose which parties are bought and sold as evidence speaks for themselves.

Certificate of service and conference: this is to certify that this filing was by mail and without any service to the defendant because of a pending state court that prohibits any form of communication between the plaintiff and the defendants attorney

submitted as is

Dr Jamal Elhaj_chehade, pro-se(tentatively), plaintiff

5414 Cedar Springs # 806

Dallas Texas 75235

e-mail heyjam7@yahoo.com

